

Marlene B. Maness,

Plaintiff,

vs.

St. Louis Bread Co.,
also known as Panera Bread
also known as Panera, LLC

Defendant.

This matter is before the Court on *Pro se* Plaintiff's Motion for an extension of time to turn her disclosures over to Defendant filed on July 10, 2019. (ECF No. 55). The Motion is fully briefed and ready for disposition.

On May 30, 2019, the Court entered a Case Management Order in this case. (ECF No. 48). The Case Management Order states that Parties' initial disclosures, required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(1) were due no later than June 17, 2019. *Id.* Defendant asserts that it served Plaintiff its Rule 26(a)(1) Initial Disclosures on June 17, 2019. (ECF No. 57). Defendant further asserts that on July 2, 2019 in compliance with Local Rule 37-3.04, Defendant's counsel conferred with Plaintiff to remind her that her disclosures were overdue. *Id.* Plaintiff's Motion for Extension of Time does not provide the Court with any information as to why she is in need of an extension of time and does not raise a specific timeframe in which she intends to make her initial disclosures available to the Defendant. "Pro se representation does not excuse a party from complying with a courts' orders and with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure." *Fingerhut Corp. v. Ackra Direct Mktg. Corp.*, 86 F.3d 852, 856 (8th Cir. 1996).

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Extension of Time is **GRANTED in part**. Plaintiff shall provide the Defendant with her Rule 26 disclosures by **August 1, 2019**.

Dated this 23rd day of July, 2019.

/s/ Jean C. Hamilton
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE